

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-17 are pending and rejected in the application. Claims 1-5 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner suggests that the Applicants should claim the broadcast studio being geographically distant from the source devices. Applicants, however, have amended the claims to clarify that the identifiers and attribute information are associated with the control signals and the devices.

On page 3, the Official Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stahl (US 7,318,099). On page 4, the Official Action rejects claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lane (US 6,542,611) and Takechi (US 7,126,642). On page 5, the Official Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lane in view of Asmussen (US 7,293,279). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... a control signal detecting section to (1) identify a device which generates a control signal based on recording or reproduction of data, the device is identified based on a type and an identifier that uniquely identifies the device, and (2) identify a time of a detection of the control signal ...

... a memory storing a database comprising (i) the identifier and (ii) attribute information which describes the data recorded or reproduced by the device, the attribute information corresponding to the identifier ... (Emphasis Added)

Claim 1 relates to a system where a device generates a control signal which includes an identifier that identifies the device. The system also stores attribute information which describes the data being recorded or reproduced by the device. More specifically, the attribute information corresponds to the identifier of the device. Support for these features can be at least found on pages 16-20 of Applicants' specification and furthermore, shown in Figs. 6, 8 and 13. No new matter has been added.

In col. 5, lines 35-45, Stahl suggests a packet identifier (PID) ("*... as identified by row, the Stream Identifier, the Type of signal ... video, audio, data, a PID assigned to that type by the source, and an authorization field 430*"). Thus, Stahl suggests an identifier that is able to identify a particular type of signal (video, audio or data). Stahl, however, does not suggest that the identifier identifies the actual device (Stahl's PID only identifies the data and not the device).

Lane is directed to an echo suppressor which suppresses a voice echo on a system. Takechi is directed to an image display apparatus which shows a monitor of a tele-prompter. Asmussen is relied on for controlling a VCR from a set top box.

Neither Stahl, Lane, Takechi, Asmussen nor their combinations suggest a control signal which includes a device identifier for identifying a specific device. Furthermore, neither Stahl, Lane, Takechi, Asmussen nor their combinations suggest attribute information which describes the data being recorded or reproduced by the device, where the attribute information corresponds to the device identifier.

Applicant's claim 1 is different than the art of record because of a device identifier and attribute information in a control signal ("*... a control signal detecting section to (1) identify a device which generates a control signal based on recording or*").

reproduction of data, the device is identified based on a type and an identifier that uniquely identifies the device , and (2) identify a time of a detection of the control signal ... a memory storing a database comprising (i) the identifier and (ii) attribute information which describes the data recorded or reproduced by the device, the attribute information corresponding to the identifier ... (Emphasis Added)".

As shown in Applicants' Fig. 6, a device is identified based on its type and its identifier. For example, in Fig. 6, pin microphone 1 is identified by its type (pin microphone) and its identifier (PM-1). Thus, an identifier for identifying the specific device is located in the control signal shown in Fig. 5. Attribute information is also associated with the identifier. For example, as shown in Fig. 8, the attribute information Taro Yamada, which is the performer's name, corresponds to the identifier PM-1 of the pin microphone (the performer Taro Yamada is associated with a microphone PM-1). In another example, as shown in Applicants' Fig. 13, the attribute information may also be the title of a video clip associated with a certain VCR at a certain point in time ("*the attribute of "sports feature picture" may be associated with the identifier "VCR-1" of the VCR at 0:00:10*"). Thus, Applicants' system as recited by claim 1 includes a device type, device identifier and attribute information. Specifically, the identifier identifies the device while the attribute information describes the data being recorded or reproduced by the device. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 2-4 have similar features to claim 1. Thus, claims 2-4 are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

On page 6, the Official Action rejects claims 5-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lane in view of Engebretson (US 5,724,433). Engebretson is


Application No.: 10/583,045
Amendment Dated: March 17, 2010
Reply to Office Action of: December 28, 2009

KAN-110US

relied on for a control signal which is transformed and log encoded. Engebretson, however, does not make up for the deficiencies of Stahl, Lane, Takechi and Asmussen. Thus, claims 5-16 are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

RAE/rae/dmw/fp

Dated: March 17, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM601580